



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/575,101

04/10/2006

Uwe Johann Riedel

W1.2058 PCT-US

9405

7590  
Douglas R Hanscom  
Jones Tullar & Cooper  
Eads Station  
PO Box 2266  
Arlington, VA 22202

04/25/2008

EXAMINER

BANH, DAVID H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

4193

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/25/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/575,101	<b>Applicant(s)</b> RIEDEL, UWE JOHANN	
	<b>Examiner</b> DAVID H. BANH	<b>Art Unit</b> 4193	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 April 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/10/2006</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. Claim 33 objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 33 reads as an independent claim but is not designated to be dependent on any previous claim. Examiner believes that claim 33 is intended to be dependent on claim 18. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim 18-21, 23 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kamoda (US Patent 6,109,181).

For claims 18-19, 21 and 30, Kamoda teaches a printing unit having a printing cylinder barrel (column 3, lines 30-35) having a printing cylinder barrel having a printing cylinder barrel length, an inking unit (column 1, lines 49-55, Figure 7, label 102) cooperating with said printing cylinder, at least three inking rollers in said inking unit (column 3, lines 40-45, Figure 1, labels 13a-13c), each one of said inking rollers have a roller barrel with a roller barrel length, with the length of each of the inking rollers being less than the printing cylinder length (Figure 1, labels 7, 13a-13c), a means for supporting each of the three inking rollers for independent movement relative to the

inking cylinder (Figure 4, labels 25, 35, 13a and its changed position) and a common ink trough in said inking unit (column 2, lines 9-16).

For claim 20, Kamoda teaches that the inking roller overlaps the others in the axial direction of the printing cylinder (Figure 2, labels 13a-13c).

For claim 23, Kamoda teaches that the rotogravure printing cylinder is adjustable (column 3, lines 30-50, column 6, lines 41-52).

For claim 26, Kamoda teaches a support shaft (Figure 2, label 1) for the inking rollers (Figure 2, 13a-13c)

For claim 27, Kamoda teaches that at least two of the three inking rollers are offset from each other in a circumferential direction of the printing cylinders (Figure 2, labels 13b and 13c).

For claim 28, Kamoda teaches in Figure 1 that each inking roller has a width and the widths of the rollers are non-overlapping (labels 13a-13c).

For claim 29, Kamoda teaches in Figure 1 that the widths of the three rollers are spaced apart (Figure 1, labels 13a-13c).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamoda (US Patent 6,109,181) in view of Roth (US Patent 6,354,700B1).

Kamoda teaches all of the limitations of claim 22 as found in the parent claim 19.

Kamoda does not teach that the printing cylinder surface has areas where the ink overlaps in the axial direction of the printing cylinder. However, Roth teaches moving the ink rollers to overlap layers of ink. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to modify Kamoda by moving the ink rollers to produce overlapping areas of ink for the purpose of improving ink penetration and coverage and to reduce gaps.

6. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamoda (US Patent 6,109,181) in view of Kolbe et al. (US Patent 6,684,784B2).

Kamoda teaches all of the limitations of claim 24 as found in the parent claim 18.

Kamoda does not teach a counter-pressure cylinder to define a printing gap. However, Kolbe teaches a counter-pressure cylinder defining a printing gap (column 3, lines 54-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to modify Kamoda by adding a counter pressure cylinder to define a printing gap as taught by Kolbe for the purpose of moving the web to a position where the printing rollers can ink and print on it.

7. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamoda (US Patent 6,109,181) in view of Donnis (US Patent 5,980,141).

Kamoda teaches all of the limitations of claim 25 as found in the parent claim 18.

Kamoda does not teach that the rollers are staggered. However, Donnis teaches that the inking rollers are staggered (column 3, lines 60-68, column 4, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to

modify Kamoda by staggering the rollers as taught by Donnis for the purpose of reducing the likelihood of double feeding from the feeding tray.

8. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamoda (US Patent 6,109,181) in view of Christmann et al. (US Patent 6,283,023B1).

Kamoda teaches all of the limitations of claim 30 as found in the parent claim 18.

Kamoda does not teach that the inking rollers are separately height adjustable in the ink trough. However, Christmann teaches that the inking roller and the ink trough are height-adjustable (column 1, lines 25-30, column 2, lines 3-10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to modify Kamoda by making the inking rollers and ink trough height adjustable as taught by Christmann for the purpose of being able to control the rate and amount of inking done to the rollers.

9. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamoda (US Patent 6,109,181) in view of Paulson (US Patent 5,046,417).

Kamoda teaches all of the limitations of claim 32 as found in the parent claim 18.

Kamoda does not teach that each of the inking rollers is covered by one of terry cloth or visco-elastic covering. However, Paulson teaches the use of a terry cloth covering for rollers (column 1, lines 14-26). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to modify the rollers by covering them with terry cloth as taught by Paulson for the purpose of absorbing the liquid from the ink trough and moving it to the printing cylinder.

10. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamoda (US Patent 6,109,181) in view of Gutberlet (US Patent 1,259,394)

Kamoda teaches all of the limitations of claim 33 as found in the parent claim 18.

Kamoda does not teach that the roller barrel lengths overlap slightly. However, Gutberlet teaches that the three roller barrel lengths are slightly more than one third of the cylinder length (Figure 2, label 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time the invention was made to modify Kamoda by making the roller barrel lengths 10% more than one third of the cylinder barrel lengths for the purpose of preventing any gaps from occurring on the entirety of the printing cylinder barrel by overlapping the edges of the roller barrels.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID H. BANH whose telephone number is (571)270-3851. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30AM-5PM Alt. Fri 7:30AM-4PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Taghi Arani can be reached on 571-272-3787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 4193

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DHB

/Taghi T. Arani/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4193  
4/24/2008